



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

spoke of the great utility of Summer Schools, a point casually touched upon by the author of the essay, and the Conference then listened to an abstract of a paper by Dr. B. F. O'Connor, of Columbia College, entitled :—

8. "French taught in New York City." The object of this communication was to present a survey of the methods of teaching French now in use in the metropolis, to reduce them to fundamental classes based upon philosophical principles, and to trace in broad lines the chief epochs of growth of Modern Language study in Columbia College.

The meeting then adjourned till 3 p. m.

At the opening of the fourth session, called to order by the President, at 3.15 p. m., Prof. Sylvester Primer, of the College of Charleston, S. C., read a scientific paper,

9. "On the Factitive in German."

The design of the article is a discussion of some points of special interest in the factitive construction in German, and its comparison with that of the same case in the cognate languages. The writer gives a historical sketch of this construction as far back as it could be traced, after having discussed the nature and functions of this case and its relations to the other cases. The factitive forms a part of the predicative idea which consists of two elements, the substantial and the verbal. According as the former or latter prevails we have an intransitive or transitive verb. There is besides a third class of verbs which require in addition to the regular object a second complement or modifier for the completion of the predicative idea, *i. e.* the factitive. The prevalent opinion in regard to the pronominal suffixes *s*, and *m*, of the Aryan nominative and accusative is that the former gave precision to the subjective idea and that the subject became the case of emphasis and animation by introducing the active personal, or independent element, while the latter (the accusative) is the case of dependence. Hence the noun-form sufficed for a long time to express this relation, as seen in the neuter where the nominative and accusative are alike. The masculine and feminine suffix *m* added no new force to the noun-idea, the accusative still represented the predicative noun-relation in a general and oblique manner, while the other cases express special and peculiar relations of dependence. The accusative simply completes the defective sense of the transitive verb. Intimately connected with the regular accusative is that in which the

relation is felt to be looser, the so-called adverbial case of De Sacy including all complements of the circumstance, better expressed by a preposition and its object or by a sentence. Here the form of the noun remains the same, but its relations to the verb and subject, its functions are quite different. These functions depend upon that peculiarity in the predicate relation by which it partakes of a double nature, it has in so far the predicate nature that it predicates some quality of the substantive which it modifies; its substantive nature is seen in that it expresses qualities of the noun and conforms to the noun-government in the sentence. Grammatically the factitive has been classed with the accusative, though it differs slightly from it. The real force of the factitive functions is apparent in those transitive verbs where the substantial element is so general and vague that without further modification it conveys no accurate idea, as *ἰργάζομαι σε, δίδασκω σε*, in which another modifier than the person or thing affected by the action of the verb is needed to show how the person or thing is affected. Hence after verbs implying a state or feeling, an act, effect, or motion, we find an accessory modifier indicating the operation of any of these verbs upon the sufferer. This accessory modifier is usually called the second accusative and the generally accepted theory is that it blends with the verb to form a compound idea which governs the real accusative. But this would not cover all cases. The true solution is that this second accusative modifies not only the verbal idea but also the real object of the verb, is partly predicative and partly substantive in its nature. It thus becomes a special form of the complementary relation, which, through loss of its special case-ending, became confounded with the accusative. It naturally expresses the relations of those effects the realization of which is expressed with the idea of the verb itself and is usually connected with verbs signifying *to become, to make, to change, to turn out, etc.*, in as much as they require an object marking the effect of the action of the verb upon the passive object, the characteristic feature of the factive. The factitive, however, expresses the kindred effect and contains the principal idea of the thought expressed and has the principal accent. In German it is nicely distinguished by special forms of the objective relations, mostly after prepositions. It seldom agrees with the passive object, the verbs *werden, bleiben, heissen, nennen, and schellen*, forming the only exceptions, (*i. e.* take the factitive without prepositions). According to the action expressed, this relation may be classified under three heads: real, moral and logical.

If we trace the factitive case back to the Old High German and the Gothic we shall find a greater correspondence with the cognate Greek and Latin, but even here will appear the beginning of the tendency to the use of prepositions to express this relation.

The infinitive used with the modal and temporal auxiliaries is a real factitive. In this connection the finite verb expresses but a

temporal or modal relation and the infinitive expresses the real predicative idea, but with the *accusativus cum infinitivo* it expresses not the real predicate but the predicate of the finite verb, and is equivalent to a finite clause.

This construction has evidently encroached upon that of the present participle after verbs signifying *to hear to see, to feel, to find*, and the like, where the two constructions have ever been interchangeable, though the participial is here undoubtedly the original, since the active idea in the factitive relation usually requires the adjective for its expression. The possibility of such a change lies in the allied nature of the participle and infinitive, both of which partake of the nature of the verb and substantive, and can have active or passive meaning. It is the same change of the adjective and substantive nature as seen in the Latin participle in—*dus* when used as participle and as gerundive, or that of the German infinitive and supine when they assume, as they often do, the sense and form of the adjective. This accounts for the frequent change between infinitive, participle, and supine, and explains why one language uses one form while another prefers one of the others. But in all these changes that fine shade of meaning existing between the different expressions is disregarded.

This near approach of the participle and infinitive in expressing the relation of the factitive, points to shades of difference in its original function which, in the development of language, have been differentiated into shades of meaning naturally represented by the nearly related participle and infinitive. This differentiation, however, did not become so pronounced as to preclude an exchange of functions between the two.

The history of the origin and development of the infinitive will serve to explain the nature of the original functions of the factitive. In Sanskrit the real infinitive is expressed by the accusative case of the abstract noun formed by the suffix *tu-m*, from which we also find the instrumental case *tvá*, the dative *tavê* or *tavâi* and the gen.-abl. *tús*. It is perhaps possible to trace here the first faint beginnings of the accusative with the infinitive, so important in the later languages. After verbs of motion this infinitive takes the place of the causal dative, (from abstract in *ana*, etc.), while the special dative relation is generally expressed by the genitive. On the other hand, the dative often encroaches upon the functions of the real accusative infinitive, even with a limiting passive object, so that the accusative infinitives in *tum* and the dative (infinitives) of abstract nouns in *ana* and *a* were interchangeable. The suffix *tum* was supplanted in the later language by other suffixes, in German, by *ana*. The latter furnished in Sanskrit not only the dative case expressing the special dative relations, but also the locative case even when this case assumed dative functions. Delbrück sums up the whole matter thus :—

"Certain forms which we call infinitives are originally datives of abstract nouns which are distinguished from the datives of other nouns only by being able to take verbal constructions and in that they seldom form other cases from the same stem. Thus the infinitive in the hitherto described sense is nothing but a syntactical category." Its oldest use (as dative) is shown in the final and consecutive infinitive in Homer, which evidently extends back to the (dative) original meaning of the infinitive which had imbibed the locative element. It would thus appear that the real primitive force of the factitive was to express a causal relation existing between the verbal idea and the factitive. After verbs of motion it indicated the direction and objective point toward which the passive object, or agent, moved to execute such action. The first is a dative relation, the second an accusative relation, though, also expressed by the dative, as there were no strict boundaries. The uncertain limits between the dative and locative relations soon added a portion of the locative function to the factitive and this opened the way for the genitive and nearly related ablative, itself closely connected to the instrumental. This composite nature may in many instances account for the manifold shades of relation expressed by the factitive, extending from real apposition to those of vague and almost indefinite shades expressed by adverbs. It has generally assumed the form of the accusative, but in Latin we still find the dative (for which) after the verb *esse* and in expressions like: *rem lucro habere, laudi, crimini dare, auxilio venire*, but the genitive in *magni facere, flocci facere, etc.* Prepositions were introduced to give greater precision and exactness to this relation. For this reason the Gothic employed the preposition *du*, and it has become the almost universal use of the preposition *zu* to denote the factitive relation in Modern German.

At this point in the proceedings it was thought best to call for a final report of the Committee on Organization. To this end, the Constitution was first adopted as a whole and then the motion put and carried that those who should now sign this document should be regarded as original members of the Association. In accordance with this vote the following signatures were handed in to the Secretary:—

C. L. Andrews,
T. W. Bancroft,
H. H. Boyesen,
H. C. G. Brandt,
J. W. Bright,
Franklin Carter,
P. Carus,
Adolphe Cohn,

J. G. R. McElroy,
W. L. Montague,
B. F. O'Connor,
F. V. N. Painter,
A. H. Palmer,
Sylvester Primer,
C. F. Reeves,
H. B. Richardson,

Wm. Cook,	S. Ringer,
P. D. Dodge,	A. de Rougemont,
A. M. Elliott,	H. J. Schmitz,
C. E. Fay,	G. A. Scribner,
Edw. Grossmann,	J. S. Simonton,
C. E. Hart,	F. R. Stengel,
W. T. Hewett,	O. B. Super,
H. C. G. von Jagemann,	H. A. Todd,
J. Kargé,	B. W. Wells,
C. F. Kroeh,	H. S. White,
Jules Loiseau,	Alonzo Williams,
F. Lutz,	J. H. Worman.

To the newly organized body, thus formed, the Committee suggested the following names for the Executive Council and for the Editorial Committee, viz.:—*President*, Franklin Carter; *Secretary*, A. M. Elliott; *Treasurer*, Bernard F. O'Connor; *Executive Council*,* Timothy Whiting Bancroft, Ferdinand Bôcher, Horatio S. White, Alcée Fortier, James A. Harrison, Edward S. Joynes, James M. Hart, Paul R. de Pont, Edward L. Walter; *Editorial Committee*, Hjalmar H. Boyesen, H. C. G. Brandt, Francis A. March. As some of these gentlemen were not present, the Secretary was ordered to cast the ballot in behalf of the Association for those officers that were already members and who were then empowered to fill all vacancies in their body, in case of non-acceptance of membership by any of those at a distance. The officers chosen were: President, F. Carter, President of the Association; Prof. A. M. Elliott, Secretary; Dr. B. F. O'Connor, Treasurer; and, in addition to these, as Executive Council, Prof. T. W. Bancroft, of Brown University; Prof. H. S. White, of Cornell University; as Editorial Committee, Prof. H. H. Boyesen, of Columbia College, and Prof. H. C. G. Brandt, of Hamilton College.

On motion of Prof. Hewett, of Cornell University, a Committee of five was then appointed to examine the whole question of requirements in classical and modern languages for admission to college and requested to report to the next meeting of the Association. The following persons were named on this Committee; Profs. Hewett, Brandt, Worman; Prof. W. L. Montague, of Amherst College and Dr. H. A. Todd, of the Johns Hopkins University.

*In addition to the above named officers.

A resolution, also offered by Prof. Hewett, "That a committee of five be appointed to take into consideration the feasibility of uniting with the American Philological Society," was defeated.

The Convention here resumed its work on the papers presented, and, in the absence of Prof. Edw. S. Joynes, of South Carolina College, the Assistant Secretary read the communication sent in by him,

10. "On the progress of Modern Language study in the Colleges and Universities of the late Confederate States since the war (1860-1884)."

The study of the Modern Languages was so little known in the colleges of the South before the war, as the following statement will show, that it may be said with truth that the progress exhibited in this paper covers a little more than a decade—the years (since 1867-1876) of the restored autonomy of the Southern States, and of the reviving work of their educational institutions under the new condition of public affairs. Indeed, the results would have been only the more striking if 1870 instead of 1860 had been assumed as our starting-point of comparison; but they would not have been so significant.

Early in November I issued to forty-five colleges and universities of the late Confederate States—including all institutions of any prominence—a circular letter asking for information on the points hereafter noted. I regret to say that I have received only fifteen replies. The institutions from which returns are presented are the following:—The University of Virginia; Washington and Lee University, Va.; Roanoke College, Va.; Virginia Military Institute; Virginia Agricultural College; West Virginia University; Vanderbilt University, Tenn.; University of Arkansas; South Carolina College; Wofford College, S. C.; South Carolina Military Academy; University of Louisiana; University of Texas; South-western University, Texas; Austin College, Texas. Many of the institutions from which the most important returns might have been expected are, I regret to say, not reported: notably the University of North Carolina, the University of Tennessee, the University of Georgia, the University of Alabama, the University of Mississippi, etc. But I have good reason to know that their returns would only have confirmed the results reported.

It should be stated that some of the institutions here included have been founded since 1860. But this does not affect the value of the returns given. This fact is only a further testimony to the general awakening of education in the South since the war.